

☒ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ UNCLASSIFIEDApproved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7  
CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT☐ 25X1

3

TO:

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION & SETTLEMENT  
BRANCH/PD/OL

DATE

24 August 1966

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

4 (FINAL)

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

29 July 1966

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

Evaluation of Coherent Light Enlarger

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☒ YES☐ NOTHE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED -

100%

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED -

100% (+)

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

## INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT  
IF YES, CHECK TYPE☐ YES☒ NO

NOTE:

USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.

FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

☐ COST ☐ AWARD  
FEE☐ PERFORMANCE☐ DELIVERY

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING4. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY2. ☐ EXCELLENT5. ☒ AVERAGE3. ☐ VERY GOOD6. ☐ MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

☐ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING  
SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE☐ TERMINATE☒ OTHER (Specify) Final settlement of task

IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MANUALS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FINAL REPORT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SPECIAL TOOLING		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

10 August 1966

SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR

DIVISION

INSPECTOR

P &amp; D S

25X1

FORM  
8-66

1897

USE  
PREVIOUS  
EDITION☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ CONFIDENTIAL☒ SECRET

(12-36)

DECLASS REVIEW by NIMA/DOD

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

NARRATIVE REPORT

☐ INTERIM☒ FINAL

25X1 [ ] has completed the required work under this task. The final report was received 1 August 1966 at NPIC and this report has been reviewed. There is still some government furnished equipment at [ ] including the Coherent Light Enlarger itself and some [ ] photography classified "Confidential."

25X1 The overall performance of the contractor was good. He submitted reports on time and although a time extension was necessary to complete the work, due to a late start on the project, the contractor completed the work within the original cost estimate. In comparing the final report to the original work statement, it may be noted that Item 4 of the work statement (comparing enlargements from the [ ] enlarger to those of the Omega) was not carried out because of a lack of high quality test material and because the superior resolving capabilities of the [ ] enlarger over the Omega precludes the need for this task. [ ] did, however, perform some experiments to demonstrate the feasibility of using the enlarger for a spatial filtering device. This is written up in the final report. 25X1 25X1

25X1 The final report goes into detail on the theory of partially coherent imaging and the theoretical predictions of the degree of coherence and the imaging properties of the enlarger. Experimental evidence is given to support the theory. Comparisons are made between coherent and incoherent imaging and the pros and cons of each are discussed. Finally, the contractor sums up the study in the conclusions and recommendations. In essence the conclusion is that the [ ] enlarger is a superior optical instrument but that the use of coherent light introduces distortions when enlarging very high resolution transparencies. These distortions can be predicted when the image is simple but each sample produces different results and therefore each sample must be analyzed to determine what effects coherent light will yield in the final product. [ ] recommends that the enlarger be used either as an enlarger in the incoherent mode or as a spatial filtering device in the coherent mode of operation. 25X1

☒ SECRET

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

CONTRACT NO.

25X1

TASK NO.

3

TO:

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION & SETTLEMENT  
BRANCH/PD/OL

DATE

21 June 1966

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

3

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

31 July 1966

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

Evaluation of the Coherent Light Enlarger

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☒ YES

☐ NO

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED -

80%

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED -

70%

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT  
IF YES, CHECK TYPE

☐ YES

☒ NO

NOTE:

USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.

FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

☐ COST

☐ PERFORMANCE

☐ DELIVERY

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING

3. ☒ ABOVE AVERAGE

5. ☐ BELOW AVERAGE 7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

2. ☐ EXCELLENT

4. ☐ AVERAGE

6. ☐ BARELY ADEQUATE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR BARELY ADEQUATE, INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

☒ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING  
SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☐ TERMINATE

☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

10 June 1966

SIGNATURE OF

DIVISION

PADS

INSPECTOR'S

SIGNATURE OF APPROVER

FORM 10-65 1897

USE PREVIOUS EDITION

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☒ SECRET

(12-36)

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7  
NARRATIVE REPORT☒ INTERIM☐ FINAL

25X1  
25X1  
25X1  
Regular monthly reports have been coming in describing the work being done. Last month a meeting was held at [ ] with representatives from [ ] and NPIC. Current theories on coherence and partial coherence were discussed as well as the operation of the Coherent Light Enlarger. On 10 June, I visited the contractor to review the program. They asked for some [ ] photography, and on 20 June, this was sent to them.

25X1  
25X1  
The coherence of the various modes of lighting has been measured. Bar targets have been imaged utilizing the various modes of operation, and the results of this can be compared to the predicted results generated by the new computer program. Another transfer of funds will be required to buy additional computer time. The new computer program with the extended sampling takes 15 minutes on the computer. To complete the project, [ ] will have to predict the output of the enlarger for several different scenes. [ ] wants to use the unused funds in the construction kitty for computer time. This seems reasonable to me.

25X1  
25X1  
25X1  
25X1  
In the final phase of the program, [ ] will evaluate the performance of the enlarger as a spatial filtering device. One of the simplest practical applications is to remove raster lines from [ ] photography and photos of video pictures. [ ] will attempt to do this now. [ ] has also started roughing the final report, and they showed me the general outline of it. All seems to be running smoothly at [ ]

☒ SECRET

#991595

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

# CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

CONTRACT NO.

TASK NO.

25X1

3

TO:

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION & SETTLEMENT  
BRANCH/PD/OL

DATE

5 April 1966

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

2

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

30 June 1966

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

Evaluation of Coherent Light Enlarger

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☒ YES

☐ NO

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED -

25%

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED -

25%

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

## INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT  
IF YES, CHECK TYPE

☐ YES

☒ NO

☐ COST

☐ PERFORMANCE

☐ DELIVERY

NOTE:  
USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.  
FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING

3. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE

5. ☐ BELOW AVERAGE

7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

2. ☐ EXCELLENT

4. ☒ AVERAGE

6. ☐ BARELY ADEQUATE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR BARELY ADEQUATE, INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

☒ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING  
SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☐ TERMINATE

☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

29 March 1966

SIGNATURE OF IN

DIVISION

P&DS

INSPECTOR'S EXT

SIG

25X1

FORM 10-65 1897 USE PREVIOUS EDITION

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☒ SECRET

(12-36)

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

☒ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

NARRATIVE REPORT

☒ INTERIM☐ FINAL

25X1 [ ] has made some measurements of the coherence of the enlarger. The two pinhole interferometer was utilized to make these measurements. It was determined that the laser produced a high degree of coherence on the image plane when no ground glass or a stationary ground glass was in place, but when the ground glass was rotated the coherence was reduced.

Work with sharp edges will begin soon. This will be a second method of determining the degree of coherence and will serve as a cross check.

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ CONFIDENTIAL☒ SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

☒ SECRET

#991595  
☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

# CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

CONTRACT NO.

TASK NO.

3

TO:

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION & SETTLEMENT  
BRANCH/PD/OL

DATE

10 February 1966

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

1

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

30 June 1966

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

Evaluation of Coherent Light Enlarger

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☒ YES

☐ NO

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☒ YES ☐ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED -

16 %

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED -

19 %

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

## INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT  
IF YES, CHECK TYPE

☐ YES

☒ NO

☐ COST

☐ PERFORMANCE

☐ DELIVERY

NOTE:  
USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.  
FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

## OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING

3. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE

5. ☐ BELOW AVERAGE

7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

2. ☐ EXCELLENT

4. ☒ AVERAGE

6. ☐ BARELY ADEQUATE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR BARELY ADEQUATE, INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

☒ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING  
SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☐ TERMINATE

☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR

19 January 1966 (Personal Visit)

SIGNATURE OF

DIVISION

P&DS

INSPECTOR'S E

SIGNATURE OF APPROVER

FORM 10-65 1897

USE PREVIOUS EDITION

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☐ CONFIDENTIAL

☒ SECRET

(12-36)

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7

☒ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ UNCLASSIFIEDApproved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7  
NARRATIVE REPORT☒ INTERIM☐ FINAL

The Coherent Light Enlarger was delivered to [ ] on 8 November 1965 and was installed by the [ ] technicians. Prior to this, work had already been started on the theoretical analysis of the degree of coherence reaching the image plane. This theoretical analysis is almost complete. The next step will be to check the theoretical work with experimental data.

A few tests were run on the enlarger by [ ] and also [ ]. The results showed a probable misalignment in the optics and [ ] agreed to fix this. [ ] is providing consultant services to [ ] as provided in the contract [ ]. The period of performance on that contract was extended, at no increase in cost, to 31 July 1966. [ ] feels that their services have not been fully utilized, and this was discussed with [ ]. Since most of the work has been in mathematical analysis, not much use has been made of the enlarger itself. When experiments begin on the enlarger, [ ] will have a larger role.

Monthly reports have been sent regularly to us keeping us up-to-date on the work.

25X1  
25X125X1  
25X1  
25X1  
25X125X1  
25X1  
25X1☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ CONFIDENTIAL☒ SECRET

Approved For Release 2002/07/10 : CIA-RDP78B04747A002900030010-7